MUSK-Pls Set me

1 March 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Meeting with William G. Miller in his Office on 28 February 1975

1. Senator Church's office as a follow-on to the discussions held between Senator Church and the Director 27 February. The meeting was held to discuss the preliminary planning which Mr. Miller has under way with respect to various procedures for the Select Committees' inquiries. Mr. Miller was given, per his request, a copy of the drafts of a paper on CIA legislative history classified Secret. It was explained that the classification grew out of third agencies' inclusions but that generally the paper was unclassified and the substance of it contained in public records.

- 2. The undersigned reviewed with Mr. Miller the range of Annexes the Director had mentioned to Senator Church and went over their content in some detail. We specifically asked Miller when he would be ready to receive Secret Level information of this kind. Miller stated that he should be ready the latter part of next week and that he would appreciate receiving a set of Annexes at that time. These Annexes were also discussed in terms of Mr. Scwartz's arrival Scwartz to be the Counsel for the Committee.
- 3. I then reviewed a very preliminary draft of an Agency notice which Miller found "very forthcoming and straightforward." He asked only that it be made more specific that Agency employees need not be inhibited by the secrecy agreement with the Agency in their communications with the Committee. I inquired whether we could work out with Mr. Scwartz an appropriate statement for the Committee to use with employees prior to testimony in advising them of their Constitutional right and Miller was amenable to working out an appropriate statement. He observed, however,

25X41

that for the most part he anticipated that testimony would be taken informally and not under oath and would be more fact-finding in nature. He noted that at the outset there would be a lot to learn in order thatthe Committee Staff have a better understanding of where to focus specific inquiry and opined that the Annexes would be a very useful start.

- 4. I asked how he planned to organize to do the job. He responded that the Committee members had various interests and that it would be the plan of the Staff Director to divide the overview in terms of particular Committee Staff interests forming subcommittees of inquiry. He noted that the Committee would want to look into clandestine operations not for the particulars of an operation but rather to acquire an understanding of the patterns of clandestine activities, the types of operations and the nature of such operations as they relate to the rights of individuals in this country and abroad. He observed that in the case of allegations with respect to domestic operations the Committee would want to have fairly full disclosure and be somewhat more specific. He agreed that protection of names and incidentals important to security should be able to be masked in such a way as to avoid disfiguring the pattern of activity, its purposes and value. He generally agreed with the approach the Director had addressed in his meeting with Senator Church and indicated that in the course of the next week or so he would like to consult with us on how this can work more constructively.
- 5. I noted that the "Q" clearance arrangement should clear the way for providing selective staff members with compartmented clearances on a need-to-know basis. We would need from Miller clarification as to which specific members would require these compartmented clearances, if at all. Miller understood the importance of holding down staff access to certain technical operations and stated that he would address this subject as the investigation unfolds. He observed that he hoped that his staff could talk with as many officers in the Agency and the Community as time permits so as to gain a clear picture of what people are really doing and how they do their job. He reiterated that formal

testimony would probably be restricted to possible or suspected violations of the law. I provided him a glance at a paper prepared on CIA history which contained five organization charts from 1947: to the present. He expressed the view that this paper would be very helpful but reiterated his desire to have with the organization charts a breakdown of personnel names by branch. I emphasized that he could get an adequate historical perspective by the provision of names, say, at the Division level and stated that we would begin in response to his request that way--noting that it would be extremely difficult to recapture the details of branch level assignments. He generally acceded to this incremental approach but did not withdraw the general requirement although admitting that perhaps he might find the information not too valuable as the investigation unfolds.

- 6. I asked for some clarification on "cash flow" as the Senator had used the term in conversations with the Director. He said that basically he was interested in the disposition of funds in such areas as proprietaries where allegations had been made with respect to "avoidance of the appropriations process." He noted the Director's certification authority and observed that examination of unvouchered funds could be part of a cash flow study from 1947 to present. He observed that the requirement for the specifics of these things would probably not be immediate and down the road some but that we should be on notice to do the necessary pulling together now.
- 7. I offered to give him and his staff--when appropriate--briefings on the budget of CIA and the Intelligence Community as suggested by the Director, and Miller expressed the view this should be very helpful.
- 8. It was agreed that we would meet again Tuesday, 4 March, or shortly thereafter, in order to introduce Mr. Warner and Mr. Scwartz and to specifically focus on the employee notice and other procedural and legal issues. We will also attempt to deliver to him at that time the Secret-level Annexes.

AD/DCI/IC

25X11